DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 978 FL 007 429

AUTHOR Jacobson, Rodolfo
TITLE Incorporating Sociolinguistic Norms into an EFL Program.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the NEXTESOL National Convention (2nd, Cocoyoc, Mexico, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Bilingualism; Bilingual Students; *English (Second Language); *Language Instruction; Language Role; Language Usage; *Language Variation; Native Speakers; Non English Speaking; Second Language Learning; *Sociolinguistics; Spanish; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

It is not sufficient for students in foreign language classes to simply internalize the sound system and grammatical structure of the target language or to memorize the vocabulary. Speaking is not merely a linguistic event, but rather involves an extensive system of norms for the social interaction. The relationship between speaking and social interaction has been extensively studied by sociolinguistics. It is the purpose of this paper to: (1) briefly describe and define some of the sociolinguistic norms that have been identified, (2) show how these norms correlate with behavioral patterns observed in speaking, and (3) illustrate how drills can be devised and used in foreign language teaching to teach the interactional norms involved in speaking. The basic sociolinguistic notions of role relationship, social situation, social interaction, language choice, and speaking are discussed. Items that lend themselves to the construction of foreign language drills are personal and transactional role relationships; congruent and incongruent social situations; metaphorical and situational switching; language choice, in terms of stable and unstable bilingualism; tones and manner of communication; channels and modes; interlocutors; and speech situations, speech events, and speech acts. Sample drills are provided. (CLK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED117978

MEXTESOL SECOND NATIONAL CONVENTION 1975
Hotel Hacienda
Cocoyoc, Mexico

INCORPORATING SOCIOLINGUISTIC NORMS INTO AN EFL PROGRAM

FL007429

Rodolfo Jacobson, Ph.D.
Bicultural-Bilingual Studies
University of Texas at San Antonio, USA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

0. My recent work, first at the University of New York College at Cortland and now at the University of Texas at San Antonio, has been more concerned with English as a Second Language and Bicultural-Bilingual Education. However I promised Mr. Paul Davies that, because of the emphasis in Mexico on English as a Foreign Language, I would address myself to issues concerning EFL, but from the vantage point of a discipline that has been fascinating me for the last six or seven years, that is from the vantage point of sociolinguistics. There is ofcourse a great deal of overlapping between an EFL and ESL approach and, in some respect, it is easier to teach English as a foreign rather than a second language because in the former we can ignore, to some extent at least, the social and attitudinal perspectives of the learning experience. The EFL learner is normally not expected to integrate into or acculturate to a dominant culture and if he has decided to learn English at all, he can be expected to have the motivation for it, even though it be instrumental rather than integrative.

There can hardly be any doubt in our minds whether we are talking about one or the other kind of the teaching of English to speakers of other languages, that there is a close correlation between this kind of English instruction and the field of linguistics. All of you who are properly trained EFL teachers have had to take a number of linguistic courses to help you attain an understanding of what linguistics is all about, how sounds are structured, how grammars function and, finally, how all this is applicable to the teaching of English to speakers of Spanish. You may have often asked yourselves whether the abstract formulations of the theoretical linguist actually serve this latter purpose and if you finally decided that it did not, you have probably swept most of your linguistics under the carpet and have taught English following your pedagogical instinct.

The linguistics that you have swept under the carpet is the traditional or conventional linguistics that many of us have not been quite satisfied with. Important as it is to describe a language code as if we all lived in a homogeneous community, as if we were all ideal speakers-hearers, as if we had learned the language in roughly the same way, we are all aware of the fact that the description of a language as we hear it around ourselves does not fit this idealized picture that the structuralists and the generativists have offered us. Out of this adverse reaction to conventional linguistics, not because it is invalid but because it does not tell us the full story, grew the interest for a new discipline that would be able to capture the description of the code and also the complexities of speech as it is actually uttered by real people in a real community in real situations, thus abandoning the artificialty of the abstract linguistic analysis. This is what sociolinguistics has attempted to do and it will be the object of the present paper to first briefly define sociolinguistics and then to describe some of the sociolinguistic norms, and show how these correlate with the behavioral patterns that we observe when we actually talk. Finally, I will attempt to illustrate these interactional norms with a few token drills --or suggestions how to construct such drills-- in order to show that what the sociolinguist has found relevant to the description of speech has actual implications for the teaching of English to those who acquire it as a foreign tongue.

1. Sociolinguistics and sociolinguistic norms

Joshua Fishman, the noted social psychologist of New York's Yeshiva University, once said that what we wish to determine in sociolinguistics is "who speaks what variety of what language to whom

where, when, about what topic and with what individual intents and social consequences." This may well serve as an informal definition of the discipline, since it stresses the researcher's concern for the interlocutors (who and to whom), for the language in terms of its regional or social characteristics (what variety of what language), the message (what topic), the purpose outcome or goal (with what individual intents and social consequences), although this definition narrows down its scope by restricting the object of the inquiry to speaking alone. Elsewhere, the same scholar defines the field more formally by saying that it is

> the study of the characteristics of language varieties, the characteristics of their function and the characteristics of their speakers as these three constantly interact, change and change one another within a speech community (Fishman 1970:4)

Another way of exploring the significance of sociolinguistics is to examine the set of concepts that distinguish this discipline from other disciplines with which it is related, such as, linguistics proper, psychology or sociology. Whereas these latter disciplines have little concern for the notions alluded to in the terms listed on the handout, sociolinguistics deals with them in great detail and, as a matter of fact, builds its conceptual framework on them. It may therefore be worth looking at some of these concepts or axioms before we advance any further.

Crucial to all sociolinguistic research are such notions as (1) role relationship, (2) social situation, (3) social interaction, (4) language choice, and (5) speaking. The role relationship or relationship between any two interlocutors at a given time (1) is

characterized by the fact that the two participants recognize as well as accept acts of mutual rights and obligations which may or may not be continually stressed depending on the norms of interactional behavior that prevails in a given socio-cultural system. Thus, participants, that is, the persons most directly involved in the communicative event, and the broader audience follow the norms that the society has established for their members. Our society, for example, holds very specific expectations with regard to individuals participating in a religious ceremony. The parishioner's conduct in the presence of his priest or minister allows for little flexibility and any violation in this respect is severely criticized. The unexperienced church-goer or the follower of a different faith may easily feel uneasy in such a gathering because he ignores the ways in which he is expected to conduct himself. In other words, he ignores what his rights and his obligations are. The similarity to a foreign language situation suggests itself here quite readily. Although we may know the phonological and grammatical rules that govern the construction of our choice, we ignore the specific norms that would render our speech acceptable to another-culture interlocutor; hence, the reluctance of many learners, who do reasonably well in a controlled classroom situation, to actually talk when they find themselves in a foreign language environment.

Interactions between interlocutors may be transactional or personal. Joshua Fishman (1970:37-42) provides us with a convincing example of an interaction between two Puerto Ricans, one being the employer and the other his secretary. While he is dictating a business letter the interaction is transactional but when he discusses with

his secretary the Puerto Rican parade in New York City the interaction turns personal. The change in kind of interaction is accompanied by a change in code such that English is spoken during the transactional interaction and Spanish during the personal one. Thus, the choice of codes, among bilinguals, often emphasizes the difference between a situation in which business is transacted and one in which the same individuals engage in personal talk. The initiative of the shift, however, depends again very much upon the role relationship between participants such that in an employer-employee relationship it is the employer who initiates the shifting, whereas in a peer-peer relationship, any one may initiate the switching (see also below on language choice and code shifting).

Closely related to the above is the social situation (2), although the emphasis here lies rather in the physical and psychological setting than in the roles of the speakers. Furthermore, the preceding concept has here been expanded in that, in addition to the rights and obligations inherent in a particular role relationship, we are also concerned with the appropriateness of place and time. It has been suggested (Fishman, 1970:47) that three ingredients come together in a social situation, i.e., the role relationship of those who participate in a given situation, the physical setting of the situation and its time of occurrence. How we handle these three ingredients will determine the extent to which the social situation turns out to be acceptable to the view of the members of a given cultural group. This circumstance has prompted the sociolinguist to distinguish between congruent and incongruent situations.

In the former, all three ingredients come together in the culturally expected way; in the latter at least one of them violates our expectations. The conduct of lovers, for instance, can be characterized as implementing certain rights and duties in a certain place and at a certain time. One person insulting another does hardly reflect the expected behavior of two lovers nor is, say, a classroom or an office an appropriate place for it. By the same token, 6:00 o'clock a.m. is not the appropriate time to carry out a romantic encounter between two lovers. The situation is incongruent if any one of the last three ingredients occurs and, in order for the situation to continue, it must be rendered congruent by changing the ingredient(s) that violate(s) our expectation or else the situation must be redefined. Thus, if the two interlocutors do not settle their disagreement, the social situation must be redefined as an hostile encounter. If the two lovers, on the other hand, wish to prolong their presence in the classroom, they must redefine the social situation as "a class" and readjust their rights and duties to the behavioral pattern consonant with a classroom situation. Finally, if the two lovers wish to be at ease with the 6:00 a.m. setting, they will have to reinterpret it as "time to get ready for school or work" or "breakfast time" and postpone the romantic encounter until the time is appropriate.

The recognition of the congruency and incongruency of situations pervades all cultural and linguistic situations but not necessarily is it cross-culturally valid. In other words, as a speaker of English and member of a U.S. community I may differ in my assessment of congruency or incongruency from that of a citizen of Mexico. The illustration concerning the two lovers may be somewhat more universal but situations

that involve dinner time, the saying of grace, the sharing of household duties by husband and wife and many other culturally-bound behavioral patterns tend to differ across culture boundaries. Again, the learner of a foreign language may have to learn, in addition to his purely linguistic objectives, what is congruent and what is not, in the country where the foreign language that he is acquiring is spoken.

Two interlocutors do not only play specific roles (1) and find themselves in a particular social situation (2) but they also interact socially with one another. Depending upon whether, in their social interaction (3), the two participants view themselves as being involved in only one situation or in several different ones, they are likely to engage in shifting from one style to another. This kind of alternation of styles can also be referred to as situational switching, although many investigators associate with the former the change in style within the same language and with the latter the alternation between different languages or codes. This obviously implies that for bilinguals the alternation between two codes has roughly the same implication as has for monolinguals the change in style within the same language. As for an example you may envision the following situation: two college students meet on university grounds and talk about the party they attended the day before (Style A); a college instructor approaches the students to inform them that he had to cancel his office hours because he is leaving town and can therefore not meet with them (Style B); after the professor's departure a three-year old boy, the baby brother of one of the students, runs up to him greets him most enthusiastically and the young man briefly talks with the child (Style C); the mother, who was accompanying her younger child, now approaches the group

and talks briefly with her older son first (Style D) and then to her son's friend (Style E). In an interval of a few minutes the following five styles have occurred in the two young men's social interaction, viz.,

Style A: Peers' style

Style B: Formal Style

Style C: Small children's style, that is, adult's informal style comprehensible to small children (not necessarily baby talk)

Style D: Family style

Style E: Informal style appropriate when talking to an adult who is not the member of the family.

Each instance of style shifting is brought about by a situational change. On the other hand, all changes do not have to be situational and the sociolinguist has identified a kind of switching that is metaphorical rather than situational. Since the situation has been kept stable, no style shifting was called for. Some other motive, then, must have triggered the change in style. The contrast in emphasis, such as, the alternation between seriousness and humor or the change from disagreement to agreement, from the essential to the secondary, from friendliness to unfriendliness, may suggest to a speaker that a shift in style may arouse the audience in a most effective way. Eduardo Hernandez-Chavez and John J. Gumperz (1971:327) quote a black community worker from Richmond, California in styleshifting from Standard English to ghetto speech to achieve, through this kind of contrast, the addressee's favorable reaction to the point he is making. Says the community worker,

> You can tell me how your mother worked twenty hours a day and I can sit here and cry. I mean I can cry and I can feel for you. But as long as I don't get up and make certain that I and my children don't go through the same,

I ain't did nothin' for you, brother. That's what I'm talking about.

The intention of the ghetto English construction goes far beyond the mere meaning of the words. If it were for the lexical meaning alone, the speaker could have used the standard speech instead but to emphasize his point, he shifts to the non-standard variety used by some black speakers in order to convey such notions as shared ethnicity, awareness of socio-economic class, familiarity with ghetto speech patterns as an indication of the speaker's ability to understand the problem involved, true concern for the solution of social problems, etc.

Stylistic shifting, especially situational switching is an important element of social interaction and the use of one style rather than another is likely to offend the addressee who expects the addressor to know what the norms of social interaction of their cultural group are. This is where learners of a foreign language are most deficient. The traditional foreign language course -- and that is equally true for EFL programs -- only stresses the learning of the code, that is the grammar, the pronunciation, the vocabulary as it refers to a single style in which colloquial and formal features come together almost at random. Hence, the learner of the foreign language, because of this uni-stylistic training speaks the same way to peers and college professors, to children and family members, to boys and girls. We still have not succeeded in incorporating into EFL materials the knowledge that the awareness of different styles is as important for the learner as is his proficiency in grammatical and phonological rules.

The individual who has acquired a foreign language well enough and has thus become proficient in the use of two languages is comparable,

in terms of his language abilities, to one who has learned as a second language the dominant language spoken in his country. Both become bilinguals however their language choice (4) takes on quite different perspectives. The FSL bilingual has to struggle with a series of social, psychological and economic conflicts, whereas the EFL bilingual can concentrate on the cultural-linguistic issues that the speaking of any other language requires. In this regard the latter is in a more fortunate position. On the other hand, the EFL bilingual, if he finds himself in an area where two languages are spoken side by side and speaks himself the two languages may be at a loss to know when he can speak his own first language and when he is expected to speak the foreign language. Language choice then turns out to be a problem of gaining some understanding of the societal pattern of the host country. Stable and/or unstable bilingualism may prevail in a country and it becomes crucial for the individual to learn the appropriate rules of interaction that govern a given speech community. The sociolinguist has examined a variety of societal patterns and developed a great deal of expertise in analyzing and comprehending what occurs when a society is diglossic, that is, when two languages are so (functionally) distributed that each bilingual speaker knows when it is appropriate for him to choose one language and when, the other. This kind of stable bilingualism, however, does not obtain in every society where two languages are spoken. Bilingualism may be unstable in that bilinguals make random decisions as to the language of their choice, most likely in the direction of the dominant rather than the minority language. To illustrate stable bilingualism, we usually think of the situations in the Arab world, in Greece, in some parts of Switzerland, Haiti (Ferguson, 1959:325-40), or Paraguay (Rubin,

1962.52-58) but we can also apply it to several situations in the U.S. where English and Spanish, English and French, English and Chinese or English and Navaho are used side by side. In the American Southwest, for example, Spanish and English find themselves in a fairly stable relationship -- as far as Mexican-Americans are concerned -- such that there is a general consensus as to when it becomes appropriate to speak the language of the home and neighborhood and when, to speak the language of the broader society. Language choice can here be envisioned as the result of the proper domain, a notion that refers to the relationship there is between a language variety and the societal institution with regard to which that variety is appropriate. Studies in the Puerto Rican community(Greenfield and Fishman, 1972: 64-86), for example, have shown that Spanish is usually chosen when speakers talk about their home and their neighborhood or when they are emotionally and/or intimately involved, whereas English is chosen in the domains of education and employment. As for religion, the choice is divided such that some speakers seem to prefer Spanish and others English. Similar studies have been performed in other minority communities with similar results, that is, bilinguals in minority communities have a preference for their vernacular language in most matters related to their own ethnic group but choose the dominant language otherwise.

How does all this relate to the EFL speaker? Obviously, only to the extent to which he may find himself in a diglossic region or country and must make a decision whether it is or not appropriate to speak one rather than the other language. The learner of English as a Foreign Language in Mexico, when traveling in Texas, Arizona or California may very well have to make this particular choice. One of my graduate

students in Mexico, when I was teaching at the UNAM, expressed her amazement that Mexican-Americans would not respond to her question in Spanish and it took a great deal of effort on her part to convince them that she did not speak English and that to communicate with her, they would have to speak to her in Spanish rather than English. The EFL trained bilingual from Mexico, if properly instructed in this respect, could function better in the host country if he were able to make the appropriate choice that agrees with the expected behavior in a Spanish-speaking area of the U.S.

Speaking (5) is more than just knowing the sounds and the grammar and the words in the foreign language. It also comprises the purpose and outcome of talk, the tones and manner of communication, its channels, the sociological and educational conditions of the interlocutors and the individual as well as the collective needs as the bilingual engages in the language choice. There is within the broader notion of "speaking", the more narrowly definable one of talk or speech event. Even a speech event is not the minimum unit, since still smaller units are recognizable as we analyze a given speech event. A joke, an interjection, an opening remark, a question within a given speech event tell us all that speech acts, like those listed above, are such very small units that can be identified. There is in effect a hierarchy in "speaking", as Hymes (1974:51-62) has demonstrated, which has the speech situation as its broadest unit, the speech event as a subordinated unit to the speech situation and the speech act as its smallest unit. This hierarchy is easily understood when we think of, say, a party (the speech situation) at which several groups gather in conversation. The speaker in one such group, while making his comments (the speech event) may embed in his talk a joke

(the speech act) to emphasize the point that he has just tried to make.

Some of the earlier notions may also require some clarification before we actually consider them in an EFL context. Talk may be conceived of in terms of purpose outcome and goal. My purpose in talking to you about sociolinguistics may differ, although I hope that it will not, from its outcome and the goal that the program direction has set itself, in turn, may differ even further. Obviously, my purpose is to make you see that sociolinguistic norms can indeed be incorporated into EFL teaching. The outcome, on the other hand, could be that you feel they cannot be so incorporated. The program direction, on the other hand, may have no particular agreement in mind but only the goal that I expose you to new ideas. Furthermore, the tones and manner of communication can alter, to no little extent, the actual meaning of the words or of the grammatical structure. Sarcasm is a case in point. The person who says "what a nice guy you are" after his addressee has played a trick on him does not mean at all what the words stand for. As a matter of fact, he just means the opposite. Finally, the channel of communication may be written or spoken and, if the latter, it may be whispered, shouted, spoken softly or in a normal voice, chanted, sung, etc. It is especially the choice of the proper mode here that determines whether the participant has actually conformed to the norms of social interaction that are agreed upon in a given culture. Imagine the reaction of individuals, if the secret to be whispered into the ear were shouted; the answer to a question were sung; the insult, said in a low and soft voice; the greeting directed to someone passing by at a distance, whispered, etc. The adverse reaction to the wrong mode becomes even more obvious if we relate it to specific social experiences like

in church, in class, at a dinner party, etc. Represent yourself as shouting during the sermon, whispering to answer your teacher's question or singing to give thanks to your host for a delightful evening.

The relevance of what we have just discussed can hardly be overlooked, not only because of the importance of the interactional norms per se but because of the degree of variation that prevails as we cross cultural boundaries. Sociolinguistic norms differ as we go from culture to culture and what may be obvious in one cultural setting is by no means necessarily so in another setting. I am told that in some cultures it is perfectly in order, when talking in a group situation, to speak at the same time when another group member is also talking and the message gets somehow across to the person for whom it is intended. In our culture, we strongly oppose that two people in a group speak both at the same time. It follows from here that to truly learn a foreign language, we also must learn the sociolinguistic norms which we are expected to follow if we hope to be accepted by the members of the host country. Foreigners who violate these norms may expect some leniency if it is obvious that their error is due to different norms existing in the speaker's home country but we should not count on it, since some interactional errors are not reacted to in terms of who makes these errors but how offensive they may be to the listener's ear. Therefore, the EFL teacher must find ways to incorporate these and similar norms into his methodology to make the learning experience of his/her students such that they not only produce the right sounds and use the right grammar but also that their interactional norms become appropriate in the foreign language environment. I know of no EFL texts where sociolinguistic

findings of this nature have been incorporated systematically; hence, I will now suggest a number of token drills or recommend the construction of such drills, so that textbook writers may derive from them some ideas as to the direction to follow, if the above ideas have appeared to you worth of implementation.

2. The twenty-two sociolinguistic terms listed on the handout are summarizing, to some extent, the foregoing discussion. The definitions that have been supplied there are in most parts adaptations from texts by Joshua Fishman and Dell Hymes, others have been supplied by the author himself. The following outline can serve as a summary of the preceding material:

1. Role Relationship
   a. Transactional interaction
   b. Personal interaction

2. Social situation
   a. Congruent social situation
   b. Social incongruency

3. Social interaction and style shifting
   a. Situational switching
   b. Functionally metaphorical switching

4. Language choice
   a. Stable bilingualism (diglossia)
   b. Unstable bilingualism

5. Speaking
   a. Talk: purpose, outcome and goals
   b. Tones and manner of communication
   c. Channels and modes
   d. Interlocutors or participant
   e. Speech situation
   f. Speech event
   g. Speech act

Based upon the above, the author has selected ten items that lend themselves to the construction of EFL drills. Where no actual drills are suggested, some hints are here included to make the reader aware of

how the drills would be structured. A more detailed treatment can unfortunately not be offered here because of the lack of time and opportunity during a group presentation:

Item #1: Role relationship with attention to the difference between transactional and personal interaction.

Situation: A young man walks into a jewelry store and is waited on by a girl whom he has dated previously. When he reaches the counter, nobody else is in the store. After he greets the girl informally, the proprietor comes in and remains at short distance from the salesgirl. The interlocutors shift from intimate(personal interaction) to colloquial style(transactional interaction). The telephone rings and the proprietor takes the call. She is no longer able to supervise the salesgirl in her dialog with the customer. The interlocutors shift back to the intimate style, since personal interaction is substituted for the transactional. The structure of the dialog will accordingly fall into 3 parts, (1) personal, (2) transactional, (3) personal and students can be asked to suggest each one two short lines (question & answer) that fit into (a) the first personal interaction, (b) the transactional interaction and (c) the second personal interaction slots, e.g.

(a) Hi, honey

What're you doing here [wəc̆ duwɪn hir]

Got to talk to you [gatətɔk təyə]

Watch out. She's around. Don't want to lose my job.

(b) I would like to see some watches

Any particular brand?

I don't know. I saw one I like in the window.

Can you show it to me. I'll be happy to get it for you.

(e) Can't take you out tonight

What's wrong

Got to study for a test

Could've done it yesterday. I told you so.

Item #2: Social situation with attention to congruent and incongruent situations.

The three ingredients that determine the social situation are the rights and duties, the place and the time. To make a situation congruent, we must see to it that all three ingredients are in the culturally expected way. EFL teachers should set up a number of situations and list the three ingredients. Some of these situations should turn out to be congruent and other incongruent. Students should first identify congruencies and incongruencies and then suggest ways to change congruent situations into incongruent ones and viceversa. Congruency and incongruency should be determined in light of U.S. (or British) cultural values, e.g.

Congruent	Incongruent
Children, seated, listening to adult	Children, seated, listening to adult
Classroom	Classroom
9:00 a.m.	2:00 a.m.
Incongruent	**Congruent**
Priest or minister	Neighbor
Racetracks	Racetracks
2:00 p.m.	2:00 p.m.

Item #3: Social interaction with attention to situational switching

Depending on the addressee, the speaker is expected to engage in style shifting in order to promote an appropriate speech situation. The illustration that had been offered in the preceding section shall be the basis for the present example. Awareness for different styles can be achieved by having students match the interchange of messages with the names of the person who were addressed and responded to the focal character, e.g.

A.	What a party!	Peers
B.	Yeah. Who brought the booze?	
A.	I don't know [ay dənow]. Maybe Al.	
C.	I am glad that I happened to run into you.	Professor
A.	Yes, Sir.	
C.	I am sorry, we have to cancel the appointment for this afternoon. I have been called to Washington. I'll contact both of you as soon as I return.	
B.	Thank you for letting us know. Have a pleasant trip!	
A.	Why, Rudy Where did little Rudy come from?	Baby brother
D.	See Mommy.	
A.	Isn't that a pretty little hat!	
D.	Daddy.	
A.	Oh, daddy gave you the hat. It's so cute. Ha, I didn't expect you at school.	
E.	I had to let you know that your dad will be back today.	Mother
A.	I thought he wouldn't be here until tomorrow	
E.	You see, my husband has just returned from Washington where he was honored by President Ford.	Mother & John's friend
B.	That must have been an exciting experience. I'm sure John is looking forward to congratulating him.	
A.	I'm sorry I can't go to the library now. You understand, don't you.	John & peer
B.	Sure	

E. My car is parked over there. Let's go. - Mother & John
Why don't you stop by later. My husband would love to have you over. - Mother and John's peer

The various episodes can be rearranged so that the messages will not give away the characters involved. At a later stage, students should be asked to supply appropriate episodes that would fit characters that reflect different role relationships.

Item #4: Social situation with emphasis on metaphorical switching

Metaphorical switching differs from situational switching in that the situation does not vary but that the speaker engages in style shifting or code switching to achieve a special effect. The teacher could supply a passage in fairly formal English and explore with her students which sentence or part of a sentence could be taken out and substituted in (a) informal English (b) Spanish, e.g.

> The sociologist Oscar Lewis has suggested that individuals in a poverty-stricken urban setting participate in the culture of poverty,-- that is, culture in the anthropological sense -- because they adjust to a set of standards such as a welfare economy, the expectation of an immediate reward, low moral standards; as a matter of fact they live under highly undesirable conditions and rarely manage to emerge from their ghetto subsistence.
>
> (a) they lead a dog's life
>
> (b) llevan una vida de perros

Jokes, sarcastic statements, changes from agreement to disagreement could all serve the purpose of a functionally metaphorical switch.

Item #5: Language choice with emphasis on stable bilingualism

Language choice implies a high degree of proficiency in the foreign language such that the speaker, by now a

bilingual, is communicating as well in the other language as he is in his own. The situation that may serve as an example is a personal experience: I needed a mechanic to do a minor repair job on my automobile and approached a Mexican-American service station attendant in Galveston, Texas. There was no doubt in my mind that he was Spanish-dominant but, because I do not look Latin and because this was a job-related talk (see domains above), I felt that English was more appropriate to use. My wife was with me and we speak Spanish at home. I talked with her in Spanish but continued to speak with him in English. It took him only a short time to shift to Spanish-- this is usually rare for a conversation between Chicanos and non-Chicanos who have not met previously -- and the conversation went on smoothly in Spanish from then on. My speaking Spanish to my wife indicated to him (1) this person, although he looks like an Anglo, speaks Spanish naturally, fluently and with nativelike proficiency and (2) my speaking to him in Spanish is appropriate and does not have any social implications, that is, he does not look down on Spanish-speaking people and knows the rules of the game: not to force Spanish on Mexican-Americans in a condescendent manner.

To promote this kind of sensitivity, the teacher can provide his students with a dialog in which the speakers use either English or Spanish leaving the initiative to the addressee to shift from one language to the other. Cues like family-related, neighborhood-related or intimate matters may

trigger the shift to the vernacular language, that is, to Spanish. Topics concerning the school, employment or politics will not produce any shift. Students could thus respond in one or the other language dependent on what is being talked about, e.g.

A. This is my first year in college.
B. (I am a freshman myself. What is your major)
A. Spanish. What is yours?
B. (Anthropology. I love it. By the way, do you speak Spanish at home.)
A. Faltara mas. Mi 'amá ni entiende el ingles.
B. (La mia si lo entiende pero mi 'apa no quiere que se platique en ingles en casa. Dice que lo puedo hablar en mi escuela y en el trabajo.)
A. Mano, so you are working. Canijo! Where do you work?
B. (I got a job at the supermarket. It helps me with the expenses at school.)

Shifting from one domain to the next will not always produce codeshifting but it is important to internalize in the learner the sensitivity that a change of speaker, of topics or of social situation may require it to make the addressee feel at ease in an area of stable bilingualism.

Item #6: Language choice with emphasis on unstable bilingualism. An area of unstable bilingualism is one where total freedom of language use prevails. A dialog with random shifting can easily convey this sensation of bilingual randomness. Drills could follow the model of grammatical pattern drills where a cue given in English or Spanish would suggest to the speaker what language to use in response to a given question, e.g.

A. What time did you get home last night?
(Cue: A LAS ONCE.)
B. Llegue a las once y tu?
(Cue: DESPUES DE LA MEDIANOCHE)
A. Llegue despues de la medianoche.Estabas cansado?
(Cue: SO TIRED)
B. I was so tired! I don't know why?
(Cue: HALF A DOZEN DRINKS)

A. You had half a dozen drinks, didn't you?
(Cue: SOLAMENTE 3)
B. Solamente 3; tu sabes que no tomo mucho.
(Cue: Y ESO POR QUE)
A. Y eso por que?
(Cue: DRIVE HOME)
B. I have to drive home and I just don't care to have an accident.

Since there is no clear pattern, the language choice could also have been reversed. Another drill could consist in reversing the languages used and produce hereby an alternate dialog.

Item #7: Speaking with attention to tones and manner of communication

The tone of communication, such as sarcasm, can produce the reversal of the overt meaning. Dialogs can be constructed where the response to stimuli uses the regular tone and students are instructed to substitute a sarcastic statement for the normal one and vice versa, e.g.

A. I could not wait for you last night.
B. That was not very nice of you.
B_1 Wasn't that nice of you!

A. She called me at 4 o'clock in the morning.
B. What an excellent idea!
B_1 That was a nasty thing to do.

In a later exercise, students could be asked to give responses to questions or statements following the teacher's cues of "normal" or "sarcastic:"

I had no time to study for the test.

Sarcastic: You are such a conscientious student! Do you live far from the Campus.

Normal: Unfortunately, I do. It takes me one hour to get to school.

Item #8: Speaking with attention to channels and modes

The same message can be conveyed by using different modes. However, the modes bear a close relationship to the speech situation where the message is given. The appropriateness of a mode can be drilled by giving the student a statement and suggesting various situations in order for the student to repeat the statement whispered, shouted, spoken softly, spoken aloud or sung, e.g. " You ain't got the right"*

church [whispered] you ain't got the right

night club [sung] You ain't got the right

family quarrel [shouted] You ain't got the right

(minor) disagreement at work [softly spoken] You ain't got the right

(major) disagreement at work [loudly spoken] You ain't got the right

Item #9: Speaking with attention to the interlocutors

Situations may arise where it becomes difficult for one of the participants in a gathering to initiate or to terminate talk depending on the status of the speaker at a given time and the heat of the argument. The interlocutor who wishes to enter the discussion must find an appropriate moment to state his view without appearing to be rude. By the same token, if he has participated actively in the argument and the issue is not solved but he must leave, he must find an appropriate way to terminate his participation. The teacher may wish to construct an ongoing debate and explore with her students which would be the best way of getting into the debate or, if

*Name of a song, sung by Olivia Newton-John and recorded on MCA Record 411

already participating in the debate, how to withdraw politely. TV shows with emotional outbursts like "Maude," "All in the family," or the "Jeffersons" may lend themselves to find ways to initiate or terminate talk. Openings such as "I could not agree with you more. However ...," "This is true...," "I had a similar experience...," Your point is well taken..." are likely to smoothen the way to participation. Gestures such as changing one's posture, standing up, moving one step away may be indications that one is trying to terminate the talk as are such statements as "I have enjoyed the talk but I must run now" or "Maybe we can talk about this some more the next time," etc.

Item #10: Speaking with attention to the three hierarchical units in speech: the speech situation, the speech event and the speech act

The structure of a speech situation becomes clear when we separate the situation as a whole from a speech event and try to discover in the latter one or more separable elements. Any detailed description of situations like a Sunday family breakfast, a class period, a party, a church ceremony, a football game etc. will lend itself to the purpose. Teachers can, on the basis of such descriptions promote the awareness that a speech situation is not an amorphous mass but bears a distinct structure that is recognized by anybody who attempts to examine the situation more carefully. Take, for example, the description of a given class period: The Spanish class

is scheduled to begin at 10:00 o'clock and to end at 10:45. At 10:00 o'clock sharp the teacher walks into the room and begins to organize the work of her students who are grouped in 5 different activity centers. At 10:45 she closes her books and moves to her desk. She then opens the classroom door for the children to go to lunch. During class, the children in the centers work according to the tasks assigned, the teacher herself staying with a single group to teach them the new words that are written on the blackboard. Afterwards she has the children open their readers and the children take turns in reading sentences from the story book. The reading lesson is interrupted twice. The first time a little girl of 8 asks what the meaning of "la llorona" is and the teacher responds that "la llorona" means "the weeping woman". The second time she interrupts the reading practice herself to say more about the story, in particular how the story is told in different places outside Texas, i.e., Arizona, Mexico and Guatemala.

Students may now be asked to identify the structure of the class period. What is the speech situation? Which speech events can we identify? Which speech acts emerge clearly in the reading activity of the teacher?

The whole class period	Speech situation
The reading group	Speech event
The question regarding the word "llorona"	First speech act
The expansion on the story as told outside Texas	Second speech act

Similar practices to uncover the structure of speech situations can easily be implemented.

It has been the objective of this paper to show that the internalization of a new sound system and of the grammatical structure of the target language is by no means the end of the road in FL instruction. Therefore, it is not sufficient --despite earlier view to the contrary-- to merely acquire the automatic control of the linguistic features of the new language. As the code is acquired, it becomes necessary for the student to learn how this code can be used in a realistic foreign Language situation. "Variability" and "Norms of Social Interaction" are the two crucial concepts that help us comprehend that there is no idealized speaker-hearer, that no speech community is homogeneous and that, to function in a foreign language environment, we must know the values and the expectations that our students are to find in a less artificial setting than is our controlled classroom.

A final note: there has been some discussion regarding the distinction between receptive and productive competence and the issue has been well taken. As a matter of fact, EFL students may not always have to master, at the productive level, all that which the learning of a new code, and of a new interactional network for that matter, implies. However, the receptive knowledge of all the sound distinctions, of all the grammatical devices and, above all, of all the sociolinguistic norms of the target culture are necessary to overcome many of the hurdles of second language acquisition. The awareness of, not only productive, but also receptive competence will make of the EFL learner a far better equipped individual as he explores how English-

speaking people live and use their language. It is not impossible that some of the sociolinguistically geared concepts here discussed as, for instance stable and/or unstable bilingualism may be of no immediate concern for the person who comes to a monolingual and not a bilingual setting, and yet the knowledge of its existence is valuable since it is unpredictable when a situation may arise that requires this kind of sociolinguistic competence. Hence, the incorporation of interactional norms into a foreign language program appears to be a worthwhile expansion of the traditional EFL-oriented goals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. "Diglossia." Word, XV, 325-40.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1970. Sociolinguistics. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Greenfield, Lawrence and Joshua A. Fishman. 1972. "Situational Measures of Normative Language Views in Relation to Person, Place and Topic among Puerto Rican Bilinguals." Samir K. Ghosh, ed. Man, Language and Society. The Hague, the Netherlands: Mouton and Co.

Gumperz, John J. and Eduardo Hernandez-Chavez. 1971. "Bilingualism, Bidialectalism and Classroom Interaction." Anwar S. Dil, ed. Language in Social Groups: Essays by John J. Gumperz. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Hymes, Dell. 1974. Foundations in Sociolinguistics. Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press.